not hear Noel make that remark. On the other hand, he pointed out, Noel himself admitted he made the statement to the comfense, and strengthening the armor of the

His exposition of the law bearing on the alyzed the authorities cited by Mr. Smith and Mr. Duncan, and pointed out what to him seemed fallacious. Stahl is plainly guilty under the statute, he said, no matter how it may be construed. The doctrine fense, he declared, because in that case against whom decoy methods were used. In this case the evidence shows, he said, against Logsdon. In the Banks case the Supreme Court held that the motives of the defense might be shown for the purpose of establishing the innocence of the accused, but Mr. Spaan was of opinion that the Supreme Court did not mean that the introduction of motives should establish a complete defense. Were that the case, he declared, any kind of crime might be committed and the criminal go scot free by fabricating a defense of honorable motives.

NEWS TERRIBLY ARRAIGNED.

In Final Argument Attorney Spaan Says It Planned Logsdon's Ruin.

A stenographic report of the final argument made yesterday afternoon by Henry N. Spaan for the prosecution follows. The and was followed with the most intense Spaan said, in part:

"May the court please, there has been so much self-laudation and so many expressions of disinterested patriotism, and so many egotistical statements that I beg to be excused if, for one brief moment, I make one personal allusion. I guess everybody knows that I am a Democrat, I have tried to make it just as offensive as possible. I expect I am the only man politically disinterested in this whole business. I have no axe to grind, nothing to do but earn my fee and be true to my client. When this case is over Mr. Logsdon, politically, is my enemy. I propose to do all that I can to get James E. McCullough named on the Democratic ticket, and then we will fight it out on political lines at the polls this fall, and I will do all I can for Mr. Mc-Cullough: and if he do not happen to be the nominee, I will be for the fellow that is on the Democratic ticket. I have always made it a rule of my life that when I am employed as a lawyer in a case, my client gets the best I have got, both of brains, if any, and courage, which I am not slow to proclaim. Mr. Logsdon is my client in this case. I have no one to placate. There is no one that I fear. There is nothing that I desire except the judgment of this court in my favor, and that means in my client's favor. When I am employed in a lawsuit I hoist the black flag, and it means war to the knife, if it is to be war at all. I have no logies to make. I fear no one, certainly not opposing counsel or outside rings or cliques, and I rarely fear the court. So be, if the court pleases, that I have tongue, but I always wield it for my clients. No man get me to wag it for the other side. I never truckle nor do I ever try to propitiate the enemy, hoping for emyment in the future. I try the see it. I don't care who likes it applauds it. May I be excused for to much nal allusion. It seems to me ! am entitled to it after the virulent attack upon me personally by counsel upon the other side and by their client, the Indianapolis

THE CRIMINAL LAWYER. "Mr. Smith was speaking in the defense of a gentleman not upon trial, Mr. James this case. If I can understand the evidence, gentlemen, in its course he took the trouble and the pains to say, 'It is not necessary to defend saloon keepers and mur-

WEATHER FORECAST.

Showers To-Day, but Fair To-Morros Throughout Indiana.

WASHINGTON, June 5 .- Forecast for Saturday and Sunday: Indiana-Showers on Saturday, Sunday fair; variable winds. Ohio-Showers on Saturday in south, partly cloudy in north portion; light east winds. nois-Showers on Saturday. Sunday

fair, with rising temperature; variable Lower Michigan-Partly cloudy on Saturday. Sunday fair and warmer in northern portion; light east winds, becoming

Arkansas-Partly cloudy on Saturday; probably showers. Sunday fair, Kentucky-Partly cloudy on Saturday; probably showers. Sunday fair. Wisconsin-Fair on Saturday and Sun-day; light to fresh east winds, becoming

Minnesota-Fair on Saturday and Sunday; yariable winds. Iowa-Partly cloudy on Saturday; prob ably showers in east portion. Sunday fair, warmer. North Dakota-Fair on Saturday and Su

South Dakota-Fair on Saturday; warmer in southwest portion. Sunday fair. Nebraska—Fair in north; showers in south portion Saturday. Sunday fair; Kansas-Partly cloudy Saturday; probably local showers. Sunday fair.

Local Observations on Thursday.

Bar, Tem. R.H. Wind. Weather. Prec. East. Cloudy. South. Pt. cloudy. Maximum temperature, 76; minimum temperature, 80.

Comparative statement of mean temperature and total precipitation on June 5: 6 ***************** eparture for day..... eparture for month. arture since Jan. 1.....*192

W. T. BLYTHE, Section Director.

Yesterday's Temperatures. 7 a. m. Max. Yp. Atlanta, Ga Cansas City, Mo ander, Wyo rquette, Mich lew York, N. Y ... lorfolk, Va alt Lake City, Utah.

A Guaranteed Cure for Piles. Itching, Blind, Bleeding or Protruding Piles. Your druggist will refund your money if PAZO OINTMENT fails to cure you. 50 cents.

simply said, maintained Spaan, that he did | derers and cutthroats for fifteen years,' he with those luminous and glaring eyes of his | and expenses. at me. I knew it was meant for me. That was the intent and purpose. Well, that court please, and I felt it as such. I nearly fainted in my seat, until, if the court this case from Mr. Logsdon was, I have no please, I recovered my second wind and began to think of some things. If the court some of the worst thugs and murderers and saloon keepers that this town has ever seen or the State of Indiana has ever seen have been defended by our genial friend, Mr. Duncan, and his associate, Mr. Smith, and, therefore, I felt hopeful, cause I knew I was in self-proclaimed good company. Mr. Smith has no right to sneer at me for defending criminals and thugs. Men that defended the notorious Warren Tate and the notorious Winnie Smith and the notorious Commodore Higgins and the notorious minister of the gospel and wife murderer, Hinshaw-don't you think I was in pretty good company? I remember that Hinshaw case Mr. Smith lifted his tearful face to heaven and with the same tone of voice with which he defended this Hessian Stahl invoked the laws of morality in favor of his client; but the hard-hearted ury sent his client to the penitentiary, and he is there yet, and that client, if the court that there was not a particle of evidence please, had honorable parents like Dr. Hunt fun of are sitting in confusion, and the and had led a seemingly honorable life.

DEFENDS HIS POSITION. "Barring a few set remarks, if the court please, made more to enliven the occasion than from any desire to attack the gentlemen from the other side, I have not reflected for one moment upon Mr. Duncan or Mr. Smith, They are both men of ability, men whom I love to honor and whom I am proud to call my friends; but why should have I done except to represent Mr. Logsdon? That, if the court please, may be a hide behind the 'Holy Alliance,' so called, Smith, good as they are and high as they stand, to refuse a fee either to defend a You do not represent them. They have retogether. I make no professions. I take Don't lift yourself by the straps of your any man's' case that I deem to be honora- boots into the clouds. ble if he will pay my fee for doing it, even if he is a Republican; and Mr. Duncan will interest by a crowded courtroom. Mr. | take any man's case and so will Mr. Smith if he pays the fee, even if he is a preacher murderer. So let us call it even, boys, and quit there. We are all made of the same common clay and we are all practicing law have personally in this case. I have no |-Mr. Smith and Mr. Duncan both took ocfeeling whatever under the sun against the Citizens' League. Why, bless my soul, some of them are my best friends. I certainly have no quarrel with Mr. Noel personally, nor Mr. Brown, of the News, nor any of those gentlemen, but that is not going to prevent me, may the court presenting my side fearlessly as I understand it, both as to fact and as to the law: nunciation is. I have always found the case like this, is in court and not in the ested in the result. Why, bless our souls we are all members of the same communi ty; not any one of us is much higher than he rest, no matter how much in our dreams we may think it. Let us judge each

not by our professions. ATTACKED BY THE NEWS "Now I only speak of this because case. I don't know who inspired it: I don't care, but in last night's News I was attacked personally. It said that I never made an argument such as a lawyer ought case. So much for my self-laudation. It to make and that I had a cynical contempt for all things which lead to good. Possibly that is true. I never thought of it before, but, if the court please, I must have said something that the gentlemen who wrote the article didn't like. I am pro foundly sorry, but no scare head editorials will keep me from doing my duty to my client as I see it, although I am opposed to him in politics. I have taken an oath to stand by my clients. There is only one thing that I am willing to proclaim out of my own mouth-the question of my ability I leave to my enemies-but there is on thing I am willing to proclaim out of my mouth, and that is that I was never either bought or scared in any case; and you wil have to allow me to be a little egotistical alongside of these gentlemen. I have been in some cases where it would have been profitable to have given up some things to the other side. In all these twenty-five years while I was defending murderers and thugs and cutthroats with Smith and Duncan those offers have come to me and no man has ever known me to betray my client, never; and that is the only thing if the court please, that I am willing to vaunt in public. There have been editorials in that same paper which has an axe to grind in this case, with your Honor as a candidate at the next election, telling you that there is no case here; telling you | deal with in this case. I will again try to that you are rapidly making your record Well let us hope, and I do hope and be lieve, knowing you as I do, young as you are, that you have the courage of your con-

other by our acts, if the court please, and

the glory of our profession, if the court please, that it is filled with men who can be neither scared nor bought. RECORD OF INTEGRITY. "The legal profession stands between self at all. I do it along lines that no man stood for the poor devils in the Criminal Court with the overwhelming weight of recreant to my duty as a lawyer ff I were investigation invited by the man who ap upon the other side or upon the News that | public paper that may come out in editorials can put his finger upon a case where I did in a way that would reflect upon me. No not follow that line? Therefore, if the other man's conduct ever injures the man court please, with all of this self-vaunting, himself. It is his own conduct that does I have simply to say this, that that crit- it, and the lawyer that is true to his client

victions and that no scare editorials will

expect an employment [Laughter], because

they know I cannot be scared nor bought;

and there always comes a time when they

need just that kind of a man; and it is

next time that crowd gets into trouble

rose leaf and does no damage. "I am here to defend Ed Logsdon, and shall perform that duty fearlessly, and am not afraid to tell the truth, even if have to drag hypocrisy into daylight and show its real habiliments. I have not attacked the Citizens' League as such, al-though my genial friends, Duncan and Smith, earnest in their endeavor to represent the News and their other clients, tried to make believe that I did. I did make some remarks about some of the gentlemen who belonged to that league, mere badinage, if the court please, to round out an hour of investigation. There is not a man that I criticised that I have met since who has not met me with a kindly shake of the hand. Even our good friend Noel has called me Henry since [laughter]; they recognize that I am simply trying to do my duty as a lawyer. The people with a \$50,60 lawsuit to defend, if the court please, grow somewhat acrimonious, but let it pass, let it pass-the sun will shine over us all the days of our life anyhow! and to me it makes no difference, absolutely no differ-Each man has his own life to live and follow out according to his own lights, with his constitution and the predilections that his ancestors gave him and with his education, no matter along what lines he travels, unless he starts out as a hypocrite and a liar; and then you don't know where

THE CITIZENS' LEAGUE.

"I have not attacked the Citizens' League as a league. It is not true that I have. Mr. Duncan and Mr. Smith. Nor have I attacked its objects. Its object as proclaimed in this court were high and noble. The difficulty is, if the court please, men have tried to take advantage of a good object and have been hiding behind that to cover up their own nefarious schemes. Many a man has taken advantage of a good object to carry out schemes of that kind. What I have done, if the court please, and what I further propose to do is to draw the distinction clearly and if I can forcibly between the league as a whole-and right there I want to pause and say that such a man as Father Gavisk and Mr. Day and others, whose names I cannot now remember, never lent themselves to projects as lubious and as doubtful as this. I want to | court please? Because the law says that draw the distinction between the league as a whole and the conduct of three persons who used the league for their selfish ends without authority and in a manner to the conspiracy. Mr. Brown lives in this bring discredit upon the league only in community. He is subject to the law just the event that the league ratified and adopted the consequences of their conduct. Both Smith and Duncan are men of alertness and men who have profound knowledge of human nature and they know how to hide behind false breastworks just as quick as do the wicked men for the prosecution. They have seen fit, if the court please, for purposes of their own, to fight this case in the name of the Citizens' League when they were not authorized to do it by the evidence in this case. In other words they are doing what is so done in this wicked world. They are thing from behind breastworks in right-

eousness in defense of a Hessian, who sells put it, 'to understand this statute,' looking his self-proclaimed abilities at \$3 a day

NO QUARREL WITH LEAGUE. "We have no quarrel with the Citizens" League. The very first instruction I got in quarrel with those gentlemen; I have a in a false light.' It has been clearly demonstrated by the evidence in this case that Mr. Duncan and Mr. Smith had no right to fight in this case behind the breastworks of the Citizens League, because Mr. Day, than whom there is no better citizen in this make a little fun of him as an aside-who is also a good citizen, said that this kind of thing had been voted down by the League. Therefore, you are stripped, sirs, of your false pretense, and you are appearing here for Brown, who pays you your fee. Griffith said upon the witness stand that the Citizens' League frowned down and voted down just such a scheme as this, because they believed it would come to just what it has come to. These gentlemen of the Citizens' League that I made a little public is judging them falsely because certain men were trying to act for them, and because you and your partner are falsely pretending to represent them. That is the situation, Mr. Duncan. Denunciation and sarcasm do not belong to only one side of this case. There are adepts upon the other side. Mr. Smith kept saying to me that I was howling against the Citizens' League and calling them the 'Holy Alliance.' Well, hurry and confusion of the case I did speak at one time of the 'Holy Alliance,' but it they make any attack upon me? What | was with a benign accent, Mr. Duncan, that would have made the hair of the angels crime, but that is to be determined. I have | and you have got no right to grow indignant, at so many dollars per indignant, because I called them the 'Holy Alliance.' thug, a saloon keeper or a murderer, and | pudiated this action. They never gave their gentlemen, let us end the debate by saying | consent to it. You have got to defend here that upon that common ground we stand the stool-pigeon, Stahl, and nobody else.

FOUR MEN INVOLVED. "In this case I have charged and mainthat there were four men engaged in this conspiracy-don't look weary, John-and as lawyers, and that is all the interest I only four. Mr. Brown, acting for the News casion to say that I had attacked the character of Mr. Brown, Mr. Duncan, you were not generous when you said that. Then you forgot that large generosity.upon forgotten my speech and the evidence. it more, upon his connection with this do, and I invite either Mr. Brown's enmity or his friendship upon doing it, and it makes little difference to me which it brings about. I have got to defend my jumping on to Logsdon, and I will come to that directly. I agree with you that Mr. Brown has and does bear a fair name in this community. Nobody said otherwise except your pretended quotation of my What I have criticised him for is speech. What I have criticised him for is his conduct in this case and I proclaimed in my opening statement and I proclaim it fighting this case is because they are league against Mr. Logsdon, but it is the case of the Indianapolis News against Logsdon, with the minor satellites, Hunt and Noel, revolving in circumscribed orbits marrow of this situation. There is no Citihave said they never auing and had voted it down, and I know from conversations with those men, even my virulent speech, that they don't agree with you upon that proposition. Nobody got mad at my argument except Smith and Duncan, and they are paid to get mad and I don't blame them for doing what they are paid for. Remember, John, that

you and your friend Charley are practicing law just like the rest of us. There is no halo around your head nor around Charley's; not a bit; you are just ordinary, common clay and you will take any case that has got a fee in it, and don't get up in the clouds, please, and don't call me a criminal lawyer and knock all the glass out of your own house. MOTIVES OF EACH MAN.

"Mr. Brown was acting for the News Mr. Hunt was misrepresenting the League Noel was ministering to his own overweening self-importance and desire for notoriety. and Stahl, the stool pigeon and Hessian and peripatetic reformer, was for sale to any man that would give him \$3 a day and 'perks.' They are the people we have to make the proper distinction between the case. First, as to Mr. Brown, and I have a personal friend of mine-a man for whose ability I have admiration, and a man who began life as a poor boy and has worked himself up as a power in this community. I have no quarrel with him, and I have no criticism of him except as I am justified in making it in connection with the evidence in this case, and he will admit it as freely as any man. The only one that will not admit it is the lawyer who is trying to get the stool pigeon off and fighting behind back. Brown knows an honest statement when he hears it, and he knows an honest man when he sees As I have said before, honorable reputation, but opinion, under the evidence. conduct, as it has been defined by the evidence before this court; and I would be I will come to it directly. He was under an icism falls like a summer rain upon the and will fight for him, if the court please, rose leaf and does no damage. against the powers of hell, if need be, that man need not be afraid but what he will get employment in the next case, and pos-sibly from the very man who criticised him before. But let that go. With the evidence in this case against Mr. Brown I am concerned, and only that, and if I go beyond that, Mr. Duncan, then I am subject to criticism, and not before. It may be that, in my blind way, I do not see its drift. It may be that I give it a wrong construction. It may be that I have a savage tongue and say things a trifle too bitter, but I have the same excuse that Cassius made to Brutus: 'It is my mother that chides, not I.' ACTED FOR THE NEWS.

"Mr. Brown was the inciting of sending Martin and Noel to St. Louis after Noel had proclaimed to Ensley, which is not denied, I want your Honor to remember, that there was no evidence against this much maligned man. Well, haven't I a right to refer to that, and haven't I a right to critifor if it is not that our acts may be criticised by others and that we should not hide our light under a bushel, that we cannot act in the dark. Mr. Brown, upon his own toward the expenses of this investigation. He said upon the witness stand that he employed Duncan and Smith to defend the stool-pigeon, and that, if the court please, does not mean twenty-five cents. The evidence shows that the News agency in New York was used to send this telegram back after the scheme had been outlined, and my deduction from the evidence is, and I do not care if I am mistaken, it is mine, honestly, and I don't care whether I make an enemy of Mr. Brown or not for life-if I do he is a bigger fool than I think he ismy deduction from that evidence, if the court please, is that Mr. Brown was not acting for himself but for the News; that he was putting up twenty-five hundred dollars, not of his own money, but the money of the News. Now, if I have to fall by that statement, if that is too bitter, if that is too vituperative, if that is not an argument, I am open to criticism, but it

davit as a coconspirator. Why, if the whoever, by the smallest act, helps on the main conspiracy, no matter what his motives may have been, he is guilty of like the rest of us, and when through mistaken policy or for any other motive, if the court please, he brings himself within the pale of the law, there is not such a holy nimbus about his brow that I should refrain from calling things by their right names when I am defending another citizen who stands just as high as Mr. Brown as far as this evidence is concerned, and who has no other motive any stronger than Mr.

INDEPENDENCE OF LAWYERS "The Supreme Court the other day, if the

proclaimed the independence of the legal ought to have a right to perform them without fear even of the United States Court. Long before that decision was rendered you and I, Mr. Duncan, have never been guilty of proving recalcitrant to the interests of our clients. We have stood up for them under the scathing abuse of imes we have been compelled to force a verdict of innocence when the court has made up its mind that the verdict should be one of guilt. It was the dignity of our profession that we stood for, and that is what I stand for now. Logsdon is my client. Neither you nor Mr. Smith nor the Indianapolis News can scare me away from say the same thing to this court. The court might send me to jail, but I would say what I thought nevertheless; I am satisfied the court would get the worst of it in the So much for Mr. Brown. That is all I said about him and all I have criticised him for. Your Honor remembers the evidence as to his connection with the case.

PAYS RESPECTS TO HUNT. "Now Dr. Hunt-the only excuse that my friend Mr. Duncan had for Dr. Hunt was that he had known his father and his mother and they were honorable people. . . . But that is not argument, Mr. Duncan, absolutely none, and you know it. How many Sunday school teachers, bank presidents and ex-preachers have gone to the penitentiary within your knowledge, within your personal knowledge? You judge men by their acts, not by their parentage! Dr. Hunt misrepresented this league, deliberately and purposely. He has not acted the part of an honorable gentleman, and there is not a member of the league that says he did. They all repudiate his action, every one of them. He is a marplot, a man who is a fitting runningmate with Noel. "It is a dangerous thing, if the court

please, to put a small man in a responsible position. He can commit more follies that will result to more trouble than all the crimes that can be committed by men within invidious and mean motives. Put a fool where he don't belong and it will not be long until his friends are ashamed of him. 'A whip for the horse, a bridle for the ass, but a rod for the fool's back,' said Solomon, and Solomon ought to know. That is the only defense you have here of Dr. Hunt and his conduct—that he had hon-NOEL AS RICHARD III.

to come in when it is wet, and he tries to occupy a great man's place, like Folk's, why the angels simply weep and the gods

please, what excuse is there for him, the Hessian, the peripatetic reformer, the man who is here to-day and yonder to-morrow -and I think the real reason why they are afraid he will run away, if this court binds him over, and the chances are he willwhat have they got to say for him? Why they say Folk says he is a good man. Why didn't they get Folk's affidavit? Oh, these people don't have to swear to anything. We are expected to take their word for anything. Noel and Martin who came here tell us that this man Folk cried this man up to the skies. We have just as good as that that he is an ingrate, a poltroon, and that he has been discharged for incapacity and because his employers didn't think he was an honest man. That is just as good evidence as theirs, just as good. And he does not look like a very good man to me, except in size, and I am not much afraid of that.

DEFENSE OF LOGSDON. "Now, what is the matter with this man Logsdon that these people should rise up against him? Why is it that these sleuthhounds should turn their legs up against this man? His character, if the court please, under this evidence is just as good as Mr. Brown's or Mr. Noel's or Dr. Hunt's, pigeon Stahl's, is it not? Is it not? What was there against it to cause your animadversions and your criticism-I mean in the evidence, Mr. Duncan, not your rhetorical periods. What does character mean, if the court please? Who has wagged tongue against Ed Logsdon's character for honesty except the men immediately engaged here, and I will come to that directly. His character, if the court please, ought to stand between the criticism as the wall of fear does between a man and destruction. a defense? We gave this poor importation. this quandom client of yours, this man who is not your real client, a chance to go on the witness stand so that we could have shown his real reputation, and you knew that I was loaded for bear, and you didn't dare to put him on the witness stand. And yet you attack Logsdon. What have you got against Logsdon except the reports of this cowardly client of yours that didn't dare go upon the witness stand and give the prosecution a chance to show just exactly what kind of a man he is? Before you arraign and denounce us, or me, be honest. Don't assume a virtue you haven't

NOTHING BUT RUMORS.

you stand on. What do you know against Ed Logsdon in this case? I will tell you: pointed him to office. Why? Because he was guilty? No; but because there were resent that committee saying to Mr. Ensley, which is not denied, that before he went to St. Louis there was nothing against this man under the sun; that he was as straight as a string. That is a pretty good reputation, is it not, from your own wit-

"Noel admitted to Eppert and Wynne that Logsdon was an honest man and as straight as a string. Don't you believe Eppert and Wynne: Eppert, an anti-administration Reblican-and whenever you find these antifellows they are a good deal worse than a Democrat, a good deal-and yet Eppert swears that Noel told him that Logsdon was an honest man after Stahl's arrest, if the court please. And Wynne swears to the same thing. Ah, but how they hugged the delusion of Shea's testimony to their breasts as a defense. It simply shows that when a man is drowning he will catch at a floating anything-anything, no matter where

"Now, what does Shea testify to? Shea says he didn't hear that kind of a state-ment. What does Noel testify to? He says he did make the statement that Logsdon was an honest man, but says he used it in the past tense and not in the present tense. Well, reconcile Noel's testimony with Shea before you criticise Wynne and Eppert. Reconcile the statement of Noel and Shea, Mr. Duncan, before you call Eppert and Wynne, by innuendo, which is alllars. When I have occasion to call a man a liar, he always knows just exactly what I mean. That is the reason they say I have got a savage tongue. But when you call a man a liar you hide behind an innuendo so that you can apologize afterwards with profit. That's the distinction. You called both Wynne and Eppert liars in this case. and you said in so many words that it was politics that made them lie for their friend Logsdon, when your own man admitted that he did say that Logsdon was an honest man but that the distinction was that he used it in the past tense instead of the present tense. And Shea said he didn't hear him say that he was an honest man. Now how much comfort do you expect to get out of that when really honest men. who have got some discernment, come to size up that kind of testimony? What a beautiful picture your man Noel will present when he goes before that committee after having called Eppert and Wynne liars -or you did for him! Well, I should think that he ought to resign and go to the wilds of Epsidam and mourn for six or seven months and come back with sense and

CALLS NOEL A HYPOCRITE. "The truth of the matter is your man Noel was simply trying to carry water on both shoulders and he lied to both sides. That is all there is of it. And as I said the other day, it is the case of a man with monumental egotism actuated by a peanut intellect. That is all there is of it. It just illustrates what I said awhile ago; you put a fool in a responsible position and God only knows what the result will be. It may be more disastrous than all the crimes in the world, and usually is.

profession. They proclaimed that a lawyer cuse. Where do you find any better men, had his duties to perform and that he Mr. Duncan, than Mr. Wynne and Mr. Eppert? Where do you go for your good peo-ple? Do you think that anybody that has appeared upon your side, or that has symeither one of these two men! better they have proclaimed it themselves, courts, under misconstruction and often- or admit it, for nobody else does. They are just as good people as live in the city of Indianapolis, and with just as clean an appreciation of the moral situation as just as good; and they say that your man Noel did say that; and the only way out of it is to try to make this court believe that they lied, and you cannot do it. And you cannot make the community do it. I just simply want to picture to you what the real situation is in this case, and what you have been attempting to do.

"Now you must remember that Mr. Noel is the same man who denied that he said Stahl gave the whole snap away like a farmer, and yet even your vaunted man Shea sanctioned that report in which it is shown that he did say it. False in one thing, false in everything, Mr. Duncan. That is the rule of the law. And if a man so glosses over one statement the pre-sumption is that his conscience is pliant enough to gloss over another, especially if that other condemns him to be a liar, and

if not that at least a fool. GUS RAHKE AND GAMBLING.

"Why, then, is it, if the court please, that Mr. Duncan justifies his attack upon Mr. Logsdon, and why does he make this kind | of a virulent attack? Why, simply because his real client is not the Hessian Stahl. Now, upon what does he base his attacks against Mr. Logsdon? Let us analyze that for a minute, and if I leave out anything I would like to have the astute gentlemen upon the other side call my attention to it. Upon what do they base their attacks upon Oh, your speech, Mr. Duncan, about Gus Rahke and gambling was beautiful. The papers say it was classic. I agree with them. It was more than classic. It was lurid; but if I had been on your side, with the capacity the News ascribes to me for using savage language, I think I could have beaten you in denouncing Gus Rahke. Who loves Gus Rahke? Who cares for him? Who is defending Gus Rahke? A soldier of fortune, a man with loaded dice in his pocket, to prey upon the community, an eyesore to all good people! Who is defending him? You cannot escape here by attempting to put us in the position of de-fending Gus Rahke. Not for one minute. Who is Heier? Why, he is the man to whose place you sent your telegram. Who is defending him? Nobody. You simply used an old speech that you had written canvas and it cannot be wiped out, an out, Mr. Duncan. I think I heard you deliver that four or five years ago in another have tried to have drawn was that Logsdon was protecting him. That is the inference you tried to have drawn, and you tried to have this man condemned in the interests of your real employers by denouncing Gus Rahke. Gus Rahke no doubt has been guilty of many things, and no doubt has prostituted young men, and no doubt has ruined them, and no doubt will continue to do so, but what has that got to do with this case? Have you fastened that on Logsdon, except in the wild dreams of your imagination? Not at all. How do you connect the two? Why, by the lying reports of your Hessian Stahl. Have you got anything else? Is there anything else? What else have you got? Not a thing. * * * HAD NO EVIDENCE.

"Oh, yes, yes; you had the brained Hunt, the soldier of fortune, the man with everything to gain and nothing Well, how did you connect them with my client? Only in your own imagination. Only in your imagination. You have said that gambling was rampant and protected in this town. Where is your evidence, Mr. Duncan? People who think demand eviwhen it is paid for. * * .

dence. They don't want rhetoric, especially "That is the situation, if the court please. That is the evidence upon which they are trying to condemn Logsdon. Is there anything else? And yet we were compelled to listen to magnificent periods denouncing gambling and the ruining of young men and of all the ways of men that follow that kind of a trade from Mr. Duncan, and he did it well; his periods were magnificent, and especially when he stamped the floor in emphasis, the hearts upon this side sank in dismay. But when you come to measure up the situation and how the whole tirade was based upon that man's report, as I have said time and again, that he was too cowardly to swear to, and the statement of Hunt's which amounted to nothing, and which did not connect my client with it at all, what else have you got? Nothing. * . .

TO BEAT THE LIBEL SUIT. "And at the same time they are pretending that Logsdon had nothing to do with the Board of Safety or with the police department, and yet they are dumping this whole burden upon him. They don't criticise the Board of Public Safety. They don't criticise the mayor. They don't criticise the Council. They don't criticise the police. Oh, no, they criticise Logsdon in order to beat that \$50,000 libel suit that Mr. Duncan's employers have got on their "Now they say that my man Logsdon,

just as soon as this fellow came to him and he discovered that he was trying to offer him money, ought to have slapped his face or kicked him down stairs. Well, I imagine my friend Duncan, with his protuberant bdomen, kicking a man down stairs under hose circumstances! The situation is just this, and if you will look at it that way it fool; he is not a spring chicken; he has oumped up against all kinds of men, from priests to gamblers; he knows the ins and outs and the ways of men quite as well as my friend Duncan, and when he found that this man was making an offer to him that was not according to law, and which he could not understand, of course, he did not kick him down stairs. Of course, he did not slap him in the face. He was under investigation. He knew they were after him. He knew they were laying traps for him, and as soon as he had the suspicion in him, and as soon as he had the suspicion in his mind that this Hessian from St. Louis was a man trying to trap him, if the court please, he just tolled him on and let him work out his own damnation. That was the situation exactly. Slap him in the face! Why, the chances are some justice of the peace, for a fee, would have fined him for doing it. Kick him down stairs? No. He did what any wise man would have done under the circumstances. He tolled him along, and he let the fellow talk, and he agreed with him upon every proposition, trying to find out who was back of him, and, if the court please, the reason why the defense is both sorry and mad is because we have found out who was back of him; and that is where the shoe pinches and makes corns, Mr. Duncan, exactly. THOSE BACK OF STAHL.

"We have found out who was back of We do know what the nefarious scheme was. We have found out, and hence this mourning, and hence this appeal to morality, and hence this hiding behind false breastworks, and hence this proclamation of uperior holiness in the name of an institution, a league that has been as much misled as the public, just as much, and you are trying to hide behind the league because they are respectable gentlemen. That's the situation. But they repudiated you. Repudiated you on the witness stand. And yet you are trying to make this court believe that this league is back of this. These gentlemen of this league knew nothing about what was going on, except what trickled through the brain of Dr. Hunt, and God knows what mud it carried when it trickled. That is all they knew. They took his representation for it and went on this man's bond. There is no case of conspiracy against any of these men of the league outside of those whom I have named, because they were blind, they were misled. . . . "The defense are making much of the fact, may the court please, that no money was to be offered. That is after the game has been found out. Then we hear that there was no money to be offered. A criminal caught in the act, through the mouth of intelligent and ingenious counsel, can always make a defense of that kind. Don't you see? They say they had no money to offer, and didn't intend to pay it. I want to suggest that there are people interested in this case under this evidence to whom

vested if they could have got honest Ed Logsdon to take it. * • "As suggested to me, when it was nec-"As suggested to me, when it was necessary, if the court please, they had money to employ Duncan and Smith. They had money to put up, they had \$2,500 in cash to put up for this man's bond. It is the repentance of the found-out; not the explanation of the honest man. There is a big distinction—a distinction which leads in

\$1,500 would have been a sum profitably in-

GET THE

Journal

TO-MORROW

HERE ARE SOME OF THE FEATURES IT WILL CONTAIN

- 1. Illustrated article on Garfield Park, the beauty spot of the South
- 2. Illustrated advance story on the National T. P. A. Convention.
- 3. Illustrated advance story on the Modern Woodmen of America.
- 4. Gossipy story of the Union Station.
- 5. Feature on the Season of Auction Sales in Indianapolis.
- 6. Story of the New Stone Bridge Over White River at West Washington street.
- 7. Stories of the Town-Local Gossip of Interest.
- 8. Society News of Indianapolis and Near-by Towns.
- 9. Society in Reaction-Mrs. May Wright-Sewall's views on certain Social Tendencies.
- 10. An Unexplainable Enigma: Why People Cling to Religious Forms After the Interest has Been Abandoned, by "U. L.
- 11. Pod Fruits-An Interesting Little Talk About the Valuable Staples, Peas and Beans.
- 12. The Resurrection of Nathan-Story of a Surreptitious Fishing Trip and Its Results, told by A. C. Garrigus, of Kokomo.
- 13. George Ade's Social Study-The Mcdern Fable of the Cub Lover, the Superior Dad and the Lady Who Told the Truth.
- 14. Original Story-"Poor Mr. Pilkington," by Marion Wymborne,
- 15. Living in London-Tradition that Inexpensiveness Is the Rule
- Not Borne Out by Facts.
- 16. Original Porto Ricans-Government Archaeologist Makes Interesting Discoveries Concerning a Long-forgotten Race.
- 17. Silk-worm Culture-Agicultural Department Will Aid Those Who Wish to Engage in It.
- 18. Financial News and Gossip-Wall-street Letter from a Special Correspondent.

AND ALL THE STATE AND TELEGRAPH NEWS OF THE WORLD

----ALSO THE-----

BARGAIN SALES ADS.

OF THE LEADING STORES

In Indianapolis and suburbs the price of the Daily Journal is 40c a month-that's less than 10c a week. The Daily and Sunday together cost but 50c a month-only 10c more a month. If you are now paying 40c for the Daily, you should pay the other 10c a month and order the Sunday. Have it delivered to-morrow. Call either 'phone, Numbers 238 and 86.

※※※※※※※※※※※※※。※※※※※※※※※※※※※※※

of these fellows that takes things as they come, and expresses himself in the ordinary way, not educated, possibly he don't even | played with him as a cat plays with a know what 'snap' means any more than your man Noel. He told his story and acted | the fruitful land of Missouri being 'the just as a man of that kind would when he had a suspicion that this man was trying to bribe him. See the condition that he was 'stringing' the other fellow. Well, just noin. First, I will go back to the time when | tice, if the court please, how ashamed of this man telephoned him. They made a himself Stahl looks just at this minute. good deal of fun about the fact that he un- No wonder! Just simply because the biter derstood it to be about road machines. He was bit. Because the 'stringer,' if I may explained that. He said they had bought be allowed to use Missouri English, was some road machines and there had been being 'strung.' some trouble about them and he thought the fellow was telephoning about road machines. My friend Duncan actually grows hilarious over that situation, and he invokes all the figures of speech that he is capable of in trying to make fun of him under the circumstances. Well, that is mere byplay. That is mere stuffing of the bird. Now, if the court please, Mr. Logsdon was chairman of the city committee. He had to meet all kinds of men, and be friends with all kinds of men from Mr. Duncan's awful | tion that he was in. Mr. Logsdon was example, Gus Rahke, to the Catholic priest and the Methodist minister. He had to be friends to them all and turn a smiling face o them and welcome them with a word of welcome, all, the man with schemes, the man without schemes, the crazy man, the man of intellect, the man of standing, of brains; all, may the court please, he had to be friends to. Well, when this fellow telephoned he misunderstood him. Do you disbelieve that? Why, don't you think that Mr. Logsdon has borne just as good a reputation up to that time as any one who has appeared on the other side? What reason have you to believe that he is not telling the truth about that except your desire to denounce and belittle Mr. Logsdone? None at all. Not a bit. It is a lawyer's trick. I may have indulged in then myself, but it is only, Mr. Duncan, when we have a point to make that we do it, and I am trying to expose your argument upon that proposition.

HE SUSPECTED BRIBERY.

one instance to heaven and the other to de- | making him the \$1,500 proposition, he says either \$1,000 or \$1,500; and Mr. Logsdon says, 'Well, which is it, \$1,000 or \$1,500?' He knew that the fellow was trying to buy him, and from that on, if the court please, he simply mouse. And instead of the detective from JOSS AND THE MAYOR.

"Now he says, why did Logsdon go and consult Joss and the mayor? Why did he wait to consult them? Why didn't he go see Ketcham and Matson? What did he wait for? Well, why? Why, that is the easiest thing explained in the world if you will just give the man credit for the situaholding office under this city government. He was under investigation. The administration was under investigation at the same time to some extent. The administration meant Mr. Bookwalter and Mr. Joss and Mr. Logsdon and everybody else; and he had had this offer from this man, He wanted to find out what to do. He didn't want to trust his own judgment.

"He had him arrested, didn't he? He didn't believe his story, did he? Now they are going upon the theory that Logsdon found out that there wasn't any money in this deal; that he had come to the conclusion that there wasn't any money in it. Therefore when he consulted Joss, then, if the court please, Mr. Duncan's theory is that they were going to make a grand stand play, and have this man arested. Never was an argument as brilbased upon less grounds. The facts den't bear it out. It is easy enough, it is easy enough with imagination and no con-

(CONTINUED ON PAGE & COL C)